



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

In an anonymous continuation to the chronicle of Moissac, added towards the middle of the eleventh century, we read once more of the Spanish campaign of King Charles ("Carolus rex"), the submission of several cities by their Saracen ruler, Ibitaurus, and the surrender of various hostages, among whom were Ibitaurus' son and brother. Relying on the genuineness of these acts, Charles led his army as far as Saragossa, only to unmask the treachery of the Moslems. For "dum in illis partibus moraretur, commissum est bellum fortissimum die dominica. Et ceciderunt Saraceni multa milia. Et de ora nona factus est sol ora secunda." From this scene of victory, news of a revolt among the Saxons caused Charles' speedy return to the Rhine.²

In spite of the brevity of its record, our chronicle furnishes enough incidents to forecast the situation of the first part of *Roland*: Charles' invasion of Spain, the proffered submission of the Saracens, who nevertheless retain Saragossa, the selection of hostages from the Emir's household (they are sons in *Roland*).³ Up to this point both chronicle and poem practically agree with Eginhard's testimony.⁴ But what follows, the fight on a Sunday, in the neighborhood of Saragossa, and the slaughter of the Saracens, is wanting in Eginhard, though the *Annales Laurissenses* make mention of a battle in general terms. As for the miracle of the sun all texts are silent save our chronicle and *Roland*, and in *Roland*, as we know, the battle with its attendant circumstances is reserved for the story of Charlemagne's revenge.

It will be noticed that the eleventh century chronicle omits all reference to the attack on the Christian rear-guard, an omission which is not surprising, since the Roncesvalles fight does not figure in the chronicle of Moissac, the main source of our text. This text, then, would offer

a version of the Spanish invasion, which is partly confirmed by older, authoritative records, and in part owes its origin to poetic invention. Because of the commingling of fact and legend which it would present, we might perhaps discern in it a step in the process of epic development, a step which it probably would not take alone, but which had already been hazarded in other documents. Such an assumption would naturally lead to the conclusion, that the Sunday battle and the miracle of the sun had entered into popular tradition by at least the middle of the eleventh century. Therefore the presence of the miracle in the *Chanson de Roland* would not necessarily be due to our chronicle. The author of *Roland* would have taken it out of the epic material which had already gathered around his subject. In any case we should not consider him as its inventor any longer, its inventor in the sense that his inventive powers had been prompted by the story of Joshua's victory over the Amorites. That similitude had occurred to some other imaginative mind, several generations before the tales of the war in Spain and the defeat at Roncesvalles had moved him to give them a definitive form in the *Chanson de Roland*.

F. M. WARREN.

Yale University.

AN UNPUBLISHED LETTER OF IMMERMANN

The following letter by Karl Immermann, at present in my own possession, has never been published:

An den Herzoglich Sachsen Meiningschen Hofrath u.
Bibliothekar Herrn Ludwig Bechstein, Wohlge-
boren zu Meiningen.

Hoch geehrter Herr Hofrath!

Ich beile mich, auf Ihr geneigtes Schreiben vom 9ten d.M. zu erwiedern, dass mit dem November sich wahrscheinlich eine Lücke bei dem Düsseldorfer Stadttheater ergeben wird, in welche Herr Rottmeyer, seine Qualifikationen für das Fach des Liebhabers und jugendlichen Helden vorausgesetzt, einrücken könnte.

² Pertz, *Mon. Ger. Hist.*, Scriptores, vol. XIII, p. 262, ll. 4-8.

³ *Roland*, ll. 5, 6, 28, 29, 39-43, 145-150, 190, etc.

⁴ See Eginhard's *Vita Caroli Magni*, and especially the *Annales* which go under his name, as well as the *Annales Laurissenses* (Pertz, *op. cit.*, Scriptores, vol. I, pp. 158, 159), for the name of the Saracen ruler, Abuthaur, or Abithaur (also Abitauro).

Ich habe zwar schon viel Verdruss und Undank von jungen leuten erfahren, deren Ausbildung ich mir angelegen seyn lassen, indessen muss man, so lange man dem Theater Teufel sich ergeben, in diefallsigen Bemühungen nicht müde werden.

Das erste wäre, Einsendung des Rollenverzeichnisses und Angabe der Forderungen. Was das erste betrifft, so ersuche ich Sie, dasselbe zu revidieren, eventualiter zu rectificieren, damit mir kein illusorischer Catalog zugeht (wie leider sehr häufig der Fall). Hinsichtlich der Forderungen erwarte ich, dass diesselben mässig¹ sind.

Mit aufrichtiger Hochachtung,

Ihr ergebener

Immermann.

Düsseldorf,

d. 14. August 1835.

From 1824 to 1827 Immermann was judge of the Criminal Court at Magdeburg. On January 23, 1827, he was appointed Counsellor of the Provincial Court at Düsseldorf, where he went in March of the same year and remained until his death, August 25, 1840. His life in Düsseldorf was made eminently tolerable by his association with the members of the Academy of Art, and extremely useful through his invaluable services to the German stage in connection with the Düsseldorf Stadttheater.

Immermann's first connection with the theatre in Düsseldorf was in 1829, when he superintended the performance of his *Trauerspiel in Tirol*. In 1832 he went at the task of elevating the stage in the town of his adoption in earnest, and on October 8, the theatre was opened, by subscription, with a prologue by himself and Moreto's "Donna Diana." The first "Mustervorstellung" was a performance of *Emilia Galotti*, on February 1, 1833. The people of Düsseldorf were pleased with the attempt, and Prince Friedrich and a number of leading citizens then established the Düsseldorf Stadttheater with Immermann as intendant and Felix Mendelssohn as director of music. On October 28, 1833, the new theatre was opened with Immermann's *Kurfürst Johann Wilhelm im Theater*, Beethoven's *Fest-Overture*, and Kleist's *Prinz von Homburg*. For lack of public support it closed March 31, 1837, with a performance of Halm's *Griseldis*.

¹The leading players received from 33 to 84 Thaler a month.

Julius Rietz had in the meantime succeeded Mendelssohn as musical director. Aside from operas and lighter pieces, the dramas of Goethe, Schiller, Shakespeare, Calderon, Tieck, Immermann, Kleist and Lessing received special attention and, to judge from contemporary criticism, were performed with remarkable excellence. There is no indication that Rottmeyer ever joined the company, and the only other published reference to Bechstein is in a note of March 20, 1834: "Wiederholung der 'Stella,' welcher der Professor O. L. B. Wolff aus Jena und der Dichter Bechstein aus Meiningen beiwohnten."

The interesting features of Immermann's connection with the theatre at Düsseldorf are the assiduity with which the public nagged, the obstacles with which he had to contend, and the conscientiousness with which he performed his self-imposed obligations. Accusations of those "Nebenansichten" referred to by Lessing in the "Ankündigung" to his *Dramaturgie* were not lacking: it was thought that Immermann was exerting himself in order to receive a call from Friedrich Wilhelm III to the management of the Royal Theatre at Berlin. True or not, the call never came and Immermann worked with intelligent industry until there was no longer any money. The people spoke of his theatre as the "high-brow" stage, and took more interest in the plays of Bauernfeld, Schröder, and Angely than in those of Schiller, Calderon, and Shakespeare.

The German stage from 1830 to 1835 was in a deplorable plight. The Berlin Hoftheater under Graf Redern (1825-42) left everything to be desired. Schreyvogel had done as well as he could at the Vienna Burgtheater (1814-32), in view of a censorship that went to absurd lengths in its severity; but his successor, Deinhardstein, was insignificant. Tieck did much for the Dresden Hoftheater, but the intrigues of men higher up made the case hopeless. And the situation was no better at Hamburg or Mannheim, München or Weimar. Immermann's financial failure was, under such conditions, next to certain; he achieved, however, unqualified artistic success.

And he did this because of his good sense and

sincerity. He secured a complete release from his legal duties so that he might devote all of his time to the cause that lay so near his heart. He did not employ "stars" but people of promise. He took Goethe and Schröder as his models. He visited the best theatres in Germany and took notes. But what is vastly more important, and what was at that time a rarity, he had rehearsals. He would first read the play to the players with comments, then followed individual and ensemble rehearsals until everything was perfect. But he was fighting against odds; and the end was inevitable. Devrient once said that, under any circumstances, Immermann would eventually have lost interest in the matter, as did Goethe. However that may be, his intendency of the Düsseldorf Stadttheater is an inspiring chapter in the history of the German stage. He made propaganda for a high and natural type of acting, gave the public a taste for classicism when it did not know what it needed, and made stage versions of great plays that are not even now wholly superseded.

ALLEN WILSON PORTERFIELD.

Columbia University.

Burbage and Shakespeare's Stage. By Mrs. C. C. STOPES. London, The De La More Press [Sept.], 1913. xiii + 272 pp.

This book deserves the most careful attention from scholars, because Mrs. Stopes has, within the past few years, somehow (to use one of her own expressions) impressed the public with the one idea that wholly possesses and consumes her, namely, that she is a profound Shakespearean scholar. No better evidence of this could be found than the greeting which *Burbage and Shakespeare's Stage* received when it appeared a few weeks ago. The *Athenaeum* (Sept. 27, 1913, p. 323) hailed it with unstinted praise. It presents us, the reviewer declares, "with a large collection of documentary evidence duly authenticated with references. The book will take its place with those

of Halliwell-Phillipps and Fleay, Mr. Fairman Ordish and Mr. E. K. Chambers, among the histories of our stage." The *Times* (Sept. 18, 1913, p. 385) is not so flattering, especially as regards the biographical section of the book; but it feels compelled to bow to the verdict that "Mrs. Stopes is a first-class archivist and record searcher." Passing over that portion of the book dealing with biography, of negligible value, I propose in this article to examine into the validity of the claim set up by Mrs. Stopes and some of her reviewers that *Burbage and Shakespeare's Stage* is a contribution to scholarship.

The book purports to represent original research and discovery among archives. So far from the truth is this, that every important document between its covers has been printed by others, several of them many times, and some of them for over a hundred years. In nearly every instance, the compiler's method has been to use the printed work of original searchers, and to print from these as if from the original documents themselves, without giving the slightest credit to the genuine discoverers or mention of previous publication. The pretence from the beginning to the end of the book is, that the documents therein contained are first-hand discoveries. 'Tis true that, in a few instances, credit is given to others for having printed a given document, but even here the abstractor and compiler of the volume under discussion puts up the emphatic claim that she has relied upon the original source for her copy (Preface, p. x). A comparison, however, of the contents of her book with the originals, or with trustworthy prints of them, reveals the astounding fact that *not a single document in the book can be depended upon as correct*. As a matter of fact, Mrs. Stopes appears, in more than one instance, incapable of reading the manuscript she purports to print. Waiving her idiosyncrasy of insisting on an imaginary orthography, punctuation, and capitalization, in preference to the form of the real document or a reliable print (a fact in itself sufficient to shake the confidence of any scholar), what shall we say of such readings as, to take one at random, "allowynge of maides" (p. 146) for